REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-33 were originally presented.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7 are currently amended.

Claims 5, 9, 16, 23-24, and 30-31 are canceled without prejudice.

Claims 8-9, 15-16, 21-24 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,725,022 to Clayton et al. (hereinafter "Clayton") in view of Applicant's own admission as to prior art in the present specification.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-15, 17-22, 25-29 and 32-33 remain in this application.

12 13

10

11

14

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

24

23

25

5

9

7

11

12

10

13 14

15

16

18

19

22

21

24 25

35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph

Claims 8-9, 15-16, 21-24, and 28-31

Claims 8-9, 15-16, 21-24 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office asserts that the pairs of claims 8, 9; 15, 16; 21, 23; 22, 24; 28, 30; and 29, 31 are identical in their wording and recitation. Applicant has canceled claims 9, 16, 23-24, and 30-31 without prejudice to obviate this rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-33

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clayton in view of Applicant's own admission as to prior art in the present specification. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 recites:

An in-vehicle audio browser comprising:

- a first set of buttons configured to select a preset item;
- a second set of buttons configured to move forward and backward through a list of items;
- a third button configured to select between a first list of items and a second list of items associated with the audio browser, wherein the first list comprises a first plurality of bands including primary audio control bands and the second list comprises a second plurality of bands including conditional audio control bands; and

a fourth button configured to activate a function that varies depending on the selected band.

The combination of Clayton and the Applicant's own admission as to prior art in the present specification fails to teach or suggest the apparatus of claim 1.

Claim 1, as amended, includes "a third button configured to select between a first list of items and a second list of items associated with the audio browser, wherein the first list comprises a plurality of bands including primary audio control bands and the second list comprises a plurality of bands including conditional audio control bands".

The Office relies on Clayton as teaching a set of channel selector buttons 162a configured to move forward and backward through a list of items. "The channel selector 162 allows a user to manually access and select any of the audio and information channels available by browsing through them (up, down, forward, back) in a hierarchical tree". (Clayton, column 9, lines 17-21). "Under each major channel category, there are preferably subcategories. To see these subdivisions, the user would select the desired category by pressing the up or down button 162b when the category desired is highlighted". (Clayton, column 9, lines 29-34).

Thus the channel selector buttons taught by Clayton enable a user to cycle forward or backward through a single list of all possible choices of audio and information channels accessible by the device, one channel at a time. The channel selector buttons do not, however, allow a user "to select between a first list of items and a second list of items associated with the audio browser, wherein the first list comprises a plurality of bands including primary audio control bands and

the second list comprises a plurality of bands including conditional audio control bands".

The office concedes that Clayton does not teach a third button configured to select among a plurality of bands associated with the audio browser. Applicant's own admission as to prior art in the present specification is cited for its teaching of a selected band forming the basis for further selections among the content such as AM, FM1, FM2, and CD that were typical in a car stereo at the time of the Applicant's invention.

Applicant's own admission as to prior art in the present specification provides no assistance in light of Clayton as to the recited apparatus of claim 1. Rather it teaches "[a]fter selecting a particular band, the user selects a preset button to select between radio stations (or CD in a CD changer) or tuning buttons (seek and/or scan) to tune a particular radio station (or select a particular CD track)". (Page 1, lines 10-13). Since neither Clayton nor Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification teach "a third button configured to select between a first list of items and a second list of items associated with the audio browser, wherein the first list comprises a plurality of bands including primary audio control bands and the second list comprises a plurality of bands including conditional audio control bands", it would not have been obvious to combine the two references to arrive at the in-vehicle audio browser disclosed in claim 1.

Accordingly, a combination of Clayton and Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification is improper. Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

7

9

11

10

13 14

15

17

18

20

22

23

24

Dependant claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-12 depend from claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependence. Additionally, these claims include features that, when taken together with those of claim 1, define apparatuses not taught or suggested by the cited prior art.

Accordingly, a combination of Clayton and Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification is improper. Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection of claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-12 be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Clayton in view of Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification. The combination of Clayton and Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification fails to teach or suggest the apparatus of claim 13.

Independent claim 13 recites:

An in-vehicle audio browser comprising:

- a first set of buttons configured to select a preset item;
- a second button configured to select between a set of primary audio control bands and a set of conditional audio control bands; and
- a third button configured to select a band from the set of bands selected by the second button.

The combination of Clayton and the Applicant's own admission as to prior art in the present specification fails to teach or suggest the apparatus of claim 13.

ı

6

9

10

11

14

15

13

16 17

19

20

21

18

22

23

24

Claim 13 includes "a second button configured to select between a set of primary audio control bands and a set of conditional audio control bands".

The Office relies on Clayton as teaching a set of channel selector buttons 162a configured to move forward and backward through a list of items. "The channel selector 162 allows a user to manually access and select any of the audio and information channels available by browsing through them (up, down, forward, back) in a hierarchical tree". (Clayton, column 9, lines 17-21). "Under each major channel category, there are preferably subcategories. To see these subdivisions, the user would select the desired category by pressing the up or down button 162b when the category desired is highlighted". (Clayton, column 9, lines 29-34).

Thus the channel selector buttons taught by Clayton enable a user to cycle forward or backward through a single list of all possible choices of audio and information channels accessible by the device, one channel at a time. The channel selector buttons do not, however, allow a user "to select between a set of primary audio control bands and a set of conditional audio control bands".

The office concedes that Clayton does not teach a third button configured to select among a plurality of bands associated with the audio browser. Applicant's own admission as to prior art in the present specification is cited for its teaching of a selected band forming the basis for further selections among the content such as AM, FM1, FM2, and CD that were typical in a car stereo at the time of the Applicant's invention.

Applicant's own admission as to prior art in the present specification provides no assistance in light of Clayton as to the recited apparatus of claim 13. Rather it teaches "[a]fter selecting a particular band, the user selects a preset button to select between radio stations (or CD in a CD changer) or tuning buttons

(seek and/or scan) to tune a particular radio station (or select a particular CD track)". (Page 1, lines 10-13). Since neither Clayton nor Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification teach "a second button configured to select between a set of primary audio control bands and a set of conditional audio control bands", it would not have been obvious to combine the two references to arrive at the in-vehicle audio browser disclosed in claim 13.

Accordingly, a combination of Clayton and Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification is improper. Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn.

Dependant claims 14-15, and 17-18 depend from claim 13 and are allowable by virtue of this dependence. Additionally, these claims include features that, when taken together with those of claim 13, define apparatuses not taught or suggested by the cited prior art.

Accordingly, a combination of Clayton and Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification is improper. Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection of claims 14-15 and 17-18 be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Clayton in view of Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification. The combination of Clayton and Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification fails to teach or suggest the apparatus of claim 19.

Independent claim 19 recites:

б

7

20

18

23

24

A user interface for an in-vehicle audio browser, the user interface comprising:

a source button to select between a set of primary audio control bands and a set of conditional audio control bands;

a band button to select a band from the selected set of audio control bands; and

a display device coupled to the band button for displaying the band currently selected by the band button.

The combination of Clayton and the Applicant's own admission as to prior art in the present specification fails to teach or suggest the apparatus of claim 19.

Claim 19 includes "a source button to select between a set of primary audio control bands and a set of conditional audio control bands".

The Office relies on Clayton as teaching a set of channel selector buttons 162a configured to move forward and backward through a list of items. "The channel selector 162 allows a user to manually access and select any of the audio and information channels available by browsing through them (up, down, forward, back) in a hierarchical tree". (Clayton, column 9, lines 17-21). "Under each major channel category, there are preferably subcategories. To see these subdivisions, the user would select the desired category by pressing the up or down button 162b when the category desired is highlighted". (Clayton, column 9, lines 29-34).

Thus the channel selector buttons taught by Clayton enable a user to cycle forward or backward through a single list of all possible choices of audio and information channels accessible by the device, one channel at a time. The channel

selector buttons do not, however, allow a user "to select between a set of primary audio control bands and a set of conditional audio control bands".

The Office concedes that Clayton does not teach a third button configured to select among a plurality of bands associated with the audio browser. Applicant's own admission as to prior art in the present specification is cited for its teaching of a selected band forming the basis for further selections among the content such as AM, FM1, FM2, and CD that were typical in a car stereo at the time of the Applicant's invention.

Applicant's own admission as to prior art in the present specification provides no assistance in light of Clayton as to the recited apparatus of claim 19. Rather it teaches "[a]fter selecting a particular band, the user selects a preset button to select between radio stations (or CD in a CD changer) or tuning buttons (seek and/or scan) to tune a particular radio station (or select a particular CD track)". (Page 1, lines 10-13). Since neither Clayton nor Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification teach "a source button to select between a set of primary audio control bands and a set of conditional audio control bands", it would not have been obvious to combine the two references to arrive at the in-vehicle audio browser disclosed in claim 19.

Accordingly, a combination of Clayton and Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification is improper. Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Dependant claims 20-22, and 25 depend from claim 19 and are allowable by virtue of this dependence. Additionally, these claims include features that, when taken together with those of claim 19, define apparatuses not taught or suggested by the cited prior art.

1

6

9

10

12

14

13

15

17

18

19 20

21

23

22

25

24

Accordingly, a combination of Clayton and Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification is improper. Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection of claims 20-22 and 25 be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Clayton in view of Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification. The combination of Clayton and Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification fails to teach or suggest the apparatus of claim 26.

Independent claim 26 recites:

One or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to:

display a currently selected car radio band, wherein the car radio supports a primary audio control band and a conditional audio control band;

changing the currently selected car radio band in response to activation of a first car radio button; and

moving through a list of items associated with the currently selected car radio band in response to activation of a second car radio button.

The combination of Clayton and the Applicant's own admission as to prior art in the present specification fails to teach or suggest the apparatus of claim 26.

 Claim 26 includes "a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to: display a currently selected car radio band, wherein the car radio supports a primary audio control band and a conditional audio control band".

The Office relies on Clayton as teaching a set of channel selector buttons 162a configured to move forward and backward through a list of items. "The channel selector 162 allows a user to manually access and select any of the audio and information channels available by browsing through them (up, down, forward, back) in a hierarchical tree". (Clayton, column 9, lines 17-21). "Under each major channel category, there are preferably subcategories. To see these subdivisions, the user would select the desired category by pressing the up or down button 162b when the category desired is highlighted". (Clayton, column 9, lines 29-34).

Thus the channel selector buttons taught by Clayton enable a user to cycle forward or backward through a single list of all possible choices of audio and information channels accessible by the device, one channel at a time. Clayton does not teach "a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to: display a currently selected car radio band, wherein the car radio supports a primary audio control band and a conditional audio control band".

The office concedes that Clayton does not teach a third button configured to select among a plurality of bands associated with the audio browser. Applicant's own admission as to prior art in the present specification is cited for its teaching of a selected band forming the basis for further selections among the content such as AM, FM1, FM2, and CD that were typical in a car stereo at the time of the Applicant's invention.

Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification provide no assistance in light of Clayton as to the recited apparatus of claim 26. Rather it teaches "[a]fter selecting a particular band, the user selects a preset button to select between radio stations (or CD in a CD changer) or tuning buttons (seek and/or scan) to tune a particular radio station (or select a particular CD track)". (Page 1, lines 10-13). Since neither Clayton nor Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification teach "a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to: display a currently selected car radio band, wherein the car radio supports a primary audio control band and a conditional audio control band", it would not have been obvious to combine the two references to arrive at the in-vehicle audio browser disclosed in claim 26. Moreover, Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification teach away from combination with Clayton, in that they teach using a plurality of buttons, each corresponding to a set of unique channels, instead of a hierarchical list as disclosed in Clayton.

Accordingly, a combination of Clayton and Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification is improper. Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 27-29, and 32-33 depend from claim 26 and are allowable by virtue of this dependence. Additionally, these claims include features that, when taken together with those of claim 26, define apparatuses not taught or suggested by the cited prior art.

Accordingly, a combination of Clayton and Applicant's own admissions as to prior art in the present specification is improper. Applicants respectfully request that the $\S103(a)$ rejection of claims 27-29 and 32-33 be withdrawn.

3

7

9

10

11

13

12

15

14

16

18

20

21 22

23

25

CONCLUSION

Dated: May 2, 2005

All pending claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-15, 17-22, 25-29 and 32-33 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ву

Jim Patterson Reg. No. 52,103

(509) 324-9256 ext. 247

21